

✓

Sam,

We welcome the opportunity to review the draft of proposed Substantive Objectives for FY 76. As you will note from the following brief paragraphs, my colleagues have noted a number of areas in which they have questions or would like to propose modification to the basic draft. These suggestions/queries are submitted for your perusal prior to your session with the OMBers and possible consideration for incorporation in the final FY 76 Objectives.

*Fusion Summary
Comm - 20 Feb*

We do not quite understand the necessity for including "the National Command Authorities" in the introduction to the Objectives nor are we really clear on what is meant by it, i.e., the President and Vice-President or does the term include, for instance, the NMCC? If the term is intended in some larger sense, it is an innovation and an unwarranted one. The Objectives are broad national ones relating to major U.S. policy pre-occupations, and not the stuff which goes to National Command Authorities if that term is broadly defined.

If these Objectives are in priority order (which they basically seem to be), it would appear appropriate to reverse numbers 2 and 3. Major military developments and compliance with various U.S./USSR bilateral agreements rank higher in importance in the realms of U.S. interests than does Soviet extension of its political influence and military power outside the USSR -- though this subject is obviously also of priority interest. Should the Objectives not be in descending order of importance, please feel free to ignore this suggestion.

Regarding Objective 3, we believe that the subjects of "developments" and "compliance" should not be limited by the phrase "particularly as such relate." We propose rather that they be connected with and, i.e., "deployment and compliance." Additionally, it is not possible to provide intelligence on "compliance with...the Mutual Balanced Force Reduction negotiations," so we would suggest changing this to "compliance with...possible Mutual Balanced Force Reduction agreements."

Objective 5 for FY 76 (Objective 4 for FY 75) calls for intelligence only on emergency and crisis situations which require a U.S. response. This is a much narrower view ^{than the} which, as formulated, leaves no objective calling for intelligence on Latin America, [REDACTED] South and Southeast Asia unless there is an emergency or crisis requiring a U.S. response -- incidentally, what does "response" entail. It is strongly urged that the FY 75 formulation calling for "information and assessments on political and security situations or crises which significantly affect U.S. interests or require U.S. action" be retained.

Proposed Objective 6 is a grab-bag in that none of the requirements are related to U.S. policy interests, i.e., intelligence is called for on any major foreign economic development relating to energy resources and policies, the

The corresponding item in the '75 objectives (5) ties requirements to U.S. policy decisions and interests. It is much clearer and crisper and should be retained.